



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,296	07/30/2003	John Graeme Pepin	EL0475 US CIP	9720
23906	7590	03/25/2005	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			SAVAGE, JASON L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	
DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/630,296	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PEPIN, JOHN GRAEME	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jason L. Savage	<b>Art Unit</b> 1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11032003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

*il*

Art Unit: 1775

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 4-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-9 not been further treated on the merits.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Topfer et al. (Translated Article: Preparation and Properties of Nd-Fe-B Thick Layers for Magnetic Standards).

Topfer teaches a composition for forming a magnetic thick film comprising magnetic particles of NdFeB dispersed in an organic medium containing a polymer epoxy resin and solvent (p. 3, "Screen Printing").

Regarding the limitation that the polymer be selected from polyurethane or phenoxy, although Topfer only recites the use of epoxy resin as the polymer in the magnetic composition, it would have been within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to have recognized that other polymer materials could be suitable for in the magnetic composition of Topfer with a reasonable expectation of success. The

Art Unit: 1775

substitution of a phenoxy polymer for the epoxy of Topfer would have been an obvious choice given that both are similar chemically.

Topfer further teaches that the magnetic particles may be contained in the composition in an amount of 65% by weight (p. 4, "Results and Discussion") and as high as 90% by weight (p. 5, bottom of the page). Topfer also teaches that the composition may be applied to a substrate by a doctor blade, screen printing (p. 3, top) and roll milling (p. 5, bottom).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Topfer et al. (Translated Article: Preparation and Properties of Nd-Fe-B Thick Layers for Magnetic Standards) as evidenced by ISAMM'02 (Program of the ISAMM'02 International Symposium on Advanced Magnetic Materials) and Benz et al. (Article: High-Energy-Product (Pr-Nd-Ce)FeB Magnets Produced Directly from Mixed-Rare-Earth-Oxide Feed for MRI Medical Imaging Applications).

Topfer teaches what is set forth above but is silent to the NdFeB magnetic material comprising other metals such as those claimed. However, it would have been within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to have recognized that additives of any metal that known to be suitable for use with NdFeB system materials could be employed in the magnetic composition of Topfer with a reasonable expectation of success. As evidenced by ISAMM'02 on pages 2 and 4, transition metals such as Co and Cr are known to be suitable for use with NdFeB system materials and as evidenced by Benz, it is known that Pr is suitable for use with NdFeB system materials and as such, the use of the claimed elements in the NdFeB system of Topfer would have been

Art Unit: 1775

obvious. Furthermore, absent a teaching of the criticality of the additive metals, it would not provide a patentable distinction over the prior art.

It is well settled that the test of obviousness is not whether the features of one reference can be bodily incorporated into the structure of another and proper inquiry should not be limited to the specific structure shown by the references, but should be into the concepts fairly contained therein, and the overriding question to be determined is whether those concepts would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the modifications called for by the claims, *In re Van Beckum*, 169 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1971), *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969); *In re Richman*, 165 USPQ 509 (CCPA 1970); *In re Henley*, 112 USPQ 56 (CCPA 1956); *In re Sneed*, 218 USPQ 385 (Fed. Cir. 1983).


In response to the issue whether the reference is nonanalogous art, it has been held that the determination that a reference is from a nonanalogous art is twofold. First, one decides if the reference is within the field of the inventor's endeavor. If it is not, one proceeds to determine whether the reference is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved, *In re Wood*, 202 USPQ 171, 174. In the instant case, all of the cited references of Topfer, ISAMM'02 and Benz are and Barrow are generally drawn to magnetic materials of the NdFeB system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason L Savage whose telephone number is 571-272-1542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00.

Art Unit: 1775

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jason Savage  
3-18-05

  
DEBORAH JONES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER